Application No.: 09/727,991
Preliminary Amendment dated: December 22, 2005
Reply to final Office Action of: July 13, 2005

REMARKS

By the foregoing preliminary amendment, which is submitted with a request for
continued examination (RCE), claims 1, 12 and 17 have been amended. In view of the
foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicants respectfully request that the
Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being
anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757 to Multer, et al. ("Multer"). The Examiner
asserts that Multer discloses all of the limitations of claims 1-27.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12 and 17 to more particularly point
out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1
has been amended to recite that the second electronic device hosts "a conduit for each of
the plurality of applications" where the conduit is "assigned to one of the applications on
the first electronic device and the second electronic device." Claim 1 has been additionally
amended to recite that the conduit is assigned to the application on the second electronic
device. Claim 12 has similarly been amended to recite that a request for a newer version of
a web clipping application is made via a conduit hosted on the second electronic device
where the conduit is assigned to corresponding web clipping application on the first and
second electronic device. Claim 17 has been amended to recite that the second electronic
device hosts a "conduit for each of the plurality of applications" where the conduit is
assigned to a corresponding one of the plurality of applications on the first electronic
device. Additionally, claim 17 recites a second electronic device which automatically
determines, via the conduit, if the third electronic device has a newer version of the
application.

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 12 and 17, is directed to a
method of updating a plurality of applications on a first electronic device over a
communication network which includes a second and third electronic device. In particular,
the amended claims recite a conduit which is hosted by the second electronic device and

Application No.:   09/727,991
Preliminary Amendment dated: December 22, 2005
Reply to final Office Action of: July 13, 2005

assigned to one of the applications jointly on the first and second electronic device. The conduit acts as a gateway between the second electronic device (commonly referred to as a host device) and a third electronic device (server) and also as a gateway between the second electronic device (host) and the first electronic device (PDA) (see Specification, pages 26-27). The conduit facilitates synchronization of the application even when the PDA is not connected to the network (via a conduit to the communication network) so that, for instance, determining if there is a newer version of the application, occurs via the conduit.

By contrast, Multer is directed to a synchronization between the first and third electronic devices. The synchronization occurs between the first and third devices so that a difference engine transfers difference information between the first and third devices. Importantly, only the difference information (? in the Multer reference) is transferred from the first and third device with the differencing receiver in the first device reconstructing the file from the difference information (see Multer, column 6, lines 3-19). Importantly, Multer does not disclose or suggest the implementation of a conduit which is hosted on the second electronic device, as required in amended claims 1, 12 and 17.

As mentioned, Multer teaches a differencing transmitter and receiver (or differencing synchronizer). The differencing synchronizer is not hosted on the second electronic device (host in the nomenclature of the present invention). The desktop computer has a device engine (Fig. 9, and columns 11-14) but merely acts as an interface for difference information generated by the Palm device (first electronic device of the present invention). Applicant submits that the device engine does not provide the structures and functions of the conduit as provided for by the present invention.

Since the cited reference does not disclose each and every limitation recited in the amended independent claims, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 12 and 17 are allowable over the cited reference. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-11, 13-16 and 18-27, by their dependency on independent claims 1, 12 and 17 respectively, are similarly allowable.

Application No.:   09/727,991
Preliminary Amendment dated: December 22, 2005
Reply to final Office Action of: July 13, 2005

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: December 22, 2005   By:___/Reena Kuyper/_____
                                             Reena Kuyper
                                             Registration No. 33,830

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860